



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,205	01/16/2001	Winston W. Hodge	Coax 01.001	5481

48008 7590 09/26/2005

VIRTUAL LEGAL, P.C.  
MICHAEL A. KERR  
3476 EXECUTIVE POINTE WAY, UNIT 16  
CARSON CITY, NV 89706

EXAMINER

BELIVEAU, SCOTT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/761,205

Applicant(s)

HODGE ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Beliveau

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/27/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

1. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

However, the provisional application upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 1-50 of this application. In particular, the instant application is directed towards and claims subject matter pertaining to a digital headend that facilitates internal/external communications through a common shared bus and further serves to buffer of video, data and voice signals for distribution over the common bus. The examiner cannot find any reference to the particular usage of buffering video, data, and voice signals in connection with a common shared bus in the earlier filing (09/162,313).

Accordingly, the claims of the instant application shall not receive the priority of the earlier filing and shall be examined based upon the filing of the instant application or 16 January 2001.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - The numbering of elements and corresponding text labels in Figure 2 and the corresponding description of these elements is improper. In particular, the specification references element "60" as an "upconverter" (IA: Page 11, Line 16), however the label associated with element "60" designates it as "VOIP", element "62" in Figure 2 is labeled as the "upconverter" however the specification references it as a an "IP router", and element "64" is designated as an "IP router"

in Figure 2, but referenced in the specification as the “LAN switch” (IA: Page 11, Line 16). This situation may be rectified by either an appropriate correction to the specification or drawings.

- The labels for the “Multi-port Smart NIW” are inconsistent with the reference to the “Multi-port Smart NIM” components within the specification.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: “66” (Figure 2) and “140” (Figure 4). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or

amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "120" and "122" (IA: Page 13, Line 13). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

Art Unit: 2614

5. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
6. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
7. The disclosure is objected to because the reference to element “network operations center (NOC) 104” (IA: Page 15, Line 14) should be amended to reference element “network operations center (NOC) 102” and “downstream combiner 178” (IA: Page 24, Line 3) should be amended to reference “downstream combiner 172” in order to be consistent with prior numbering of this element. Appropriate correction is required.

***Request for Information***

8. Applicant and the assignee of this application are respectfully requested to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application. Figures 1 and 2 have been designated and disclosed as -- Prior Art --. Applicants are subsequently requested to provide the title, citation and copy of each publication (if any) that is a source used for the description of the prior art in the disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2614

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claim 14 is dependent upon itself. For the purpose of art evaluation, the examiner shall presume that claim 14 is to be dependent upon claim 10.

### ***Claim Objections***

11. Claims 20, 21, 25, 45, 46, and 49 are objected to because the phrase "said plurality of voice information" lacks proper antecedent basis. For the purpose of art evaluation, the examiner shall presume that the claim is referencing "a plurality of voice information". Appropriate correction is required.
12. Claims 10 and 35 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
15. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), in view of Sherlock et al. (US Pat No. 6,882,709), and in further view of Masucci et al. (US Pat No. 6,498,667).

Claims 1, 15, 26, and 40 are rejected in view of Figure 1 of APA. Figure 1 illustrates a "two-way broadband system" including a "digital headend" [10] that is "configured to process a plurality of digital video, a plurality of digital data, a plurality of voice information, and a plurality of upstream communications" (Page 3, Lines 10-13; Page 5, Lines 16-17). The headend comprises a "downstream module . . . configured to transmit said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data, and said plurality of voice information" [18/26/34/42], "upstream module . . . configured to receive said plurality of upstream communications" [30], a "cable distribution network in communications with said digital headend . . . configured to communicate a plurality of digital video, a plurality of digital data, a plurality of voice information, and a plurality of upstream communications" (Page 2, Lines 5-7; Page 3, Lines 13-16), and a "set-top box" that is "configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data . . . [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream



communications” (Page 3; Lines 13-16; Page 5, Lines 1-9). Accordingly, APA is silent with respect to the particular usage of “smart network interface modules” which are operatively coupled to a “shared bus” as well as whether or not the particular “set-top box” is necessarily configured to also “receive said plurality of voice information”.

With respect to the particular usage of a “set-top box” that is “configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data, said plurality of voice information, [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream communications”, in a related art pertaining to broadband distribution systems, the Sherlock et al. discloses the usage of a “set-top box” [155] (Col 2, Line 64 – Col 3, Line 21). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the “set-top box” of APA, so as to be “configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data, said plurality of voice information, [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream communications” as taught by Sherlock et al. for the purpose of providing an improved means by which to provide and manage enhanced telephony service offerings.

With respect to the particular usage of a “at least network interface module . . . “ and a “shared bus operatively coupled to said smart interface module”, as aforementioned, APA is silent as to the usage of such. In a related art pertaining to the broadband distribution systems, Figures 1 and 2 of the Masucci et al. reference illustrate the usage of such wherein said components are “housed within said digital headend” (Col 3, Lines 46-49). In particular, Figure 2, illustrates “at least one smart network interface module configured to buffer said plurality of video, said plurality of digital data, said plurality of voice information and said plurality of upstream communications” [112/110/108/106/104], a “shared bus”

[116] “operatively coupled to said at least one smart network interface module, said shared bus configured to transport said digital video, said plurality of digital data, said plurality of voice information, and said plurality of upstream communications”, a “downstream module operatively coupled to said shared bus . . . [and] configured to transmit said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data and said plurality of voice information” [114] and an “upstream module operatively coupled with said shared bus . . . [and] configured to receive said plurality of upstream communications” [102] (Col 1, Lines 34-38; Col 3, Line 66 – Col 4, Line 29). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify APA so as to utilize the interface architecture of Masucci et al. for the purpose of providing a means for providing diverse packet and cell-based broadband services over a low cost, high bandwidth access network (Masucci et al.: Col 1, Lines 30-33).

Claims 2, 16, 27, and 41 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a control computer” [36] that is “configured to perform content management and resource allocation” (APA: Page 5, Lines 7-10).

Claims 3, 17, 28, and 42 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a service computer” [20] that is “configured to manager conditional access” (APA: Page 3, Line 3 – Page 4, Line 2).

Claims 4, 18, 29, and 43 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a video server” [38] that is “configured to provide local storage for digital video” (APA: Page 5, Lines 9-10).

Claims 5, 19, 30, and 44 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart interface module is operatively coupled to an Internet computer” [22] that is “configured to communicate Internet data” (APA: Page 4, Lines 2-5).

Claims 6-8 and 31-33 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a telephony computer . . . configured to communicate telephony data” wherein the “telephony computer comprises a switched telephony system . . . configured to communicate telephony data” or the “telephony computer comprises a Voice over IP system . . . configured to communicate telephony data” (APA: Page 5, Lines 16-21).

Claims 9, 20, 34, and 45 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is configured to optimize the transfer of a plurality of bits associated with said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data, said plurality of voice information and said plurality of upstream communications across said shared bus” (Masucci et al.: Col 5, Lines 54-56).

Claims 10, 21, 35, and 46 are rejected as aforementioned wherein “said at least one smart network interface module is configured to buffer” [110/106] “said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data said plurality of voice information, and said plurality of upstream communications”.

In consideration of claims 11-14, 22-25, 36-39, and 47-50, the “at least one smart network interface module” are inherently “configured to buffer a plurality of . . . control data” associated with the respective “digital video”, “digital data”, “voice information”, and “upstream communications”. In the downstream direction, APA discloses the particular usage of MPEG-2 transport streams for video data and the Internet Protocol (IP) and the

data-over-cable service interface specification (DOCSIS) in connection with the voice and data communications. The usage of these standards disclose and require the usage of “control information” as necessary to process the incoming/outgoing data. For example, MPEG transport streams require control data (ex. PIDs, timing information, etc. ) in order for the STB to properly decode and reassemble the received transport stream. TCP/IP requires control information as necessary to route messages to the appropriate client/server.

16. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted prior art (APA), in view of Sherlock et al. (US Pat No. 6,882,709), and in further in view of Hirasawa (US Pat No. 4,887,075).

Claims 1, 15, 26, and 40 are rejected in view of Figure 1 of APA. Figure 1 illustrates a “two-way broadband system” including a “digital headend” [10] that is “configured to process a plurality of digital video, a plurality of digital data, a plurality of voice information, and a plurality of upstream communications” (Page 3, Lines 10-13; Page 5, Lines 16-17). The headend comprises a “downstream module . . . configured to transmit said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data, and said plurality of voice information” [18/26/34/42], “upstream module . . . configured to receive said plurality of upstream communications” [30],” a “cable distribution network in communications with said digital headend . . . configured to communicate a plurality of digital video, a plurality of digital data, a plurality of voice information, and a plurality of upstream communications” (Page 2, Lines 5-7; Page 3, Lines 13-16), and a “set-top box” that is “configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data . . . [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream communications” (Page 3; Lines 13-16; Page 5, Lines 1-9). Accordingly, APA is silent with

respect to the particular usage of “smart network interface modules” which are operatively coupled to a “shared bus” as well as whether or not the particular “set-top box” is necessarily configured to also “receive said plurality of voice information”.

With respect to the particular usage of a “set-top box” that is “configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data, said plurality of voice information, [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream communications”, in a related art pertaining to broadband distribution systems, the Sherlock et al. discloses the usage of a “set-top box” [155] (Col 2, Line 64 – Col 3, Line 21). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the “set-top box” of APA, so as to be “configured to receive said plurality of video, said plurality of data, said plurality of voice information, [and] configured to generate said plurality of upstream communications” as taught by Sherlock et al. for the purpose of providing an improved means by which to provide and manage enhanced telephony service offerings.

With respect to the particular usage of a “at least network interface module . . .” and a “shared bus operatively coupled to said smart interface module”, as aforementioned, APA is silent as to the usage of such; however, it suggests the particular usage of a LAN switch [66] (Figure 2). In a related art pertaining to switching systems, Figure 1 of Hirasawa illustrates a method for facilitating communications between multiple computers. In particular, the computers utilize “at least one smart network interface module configured to buffer” [32-n] bi-directional digital communications and a “shared bus” [30] “operatively coupled to said at least one smart network interface module”. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify APA so as

Art Unit: 2614

to utilize the “at least one smart network interface module” and the LAN “shared bus” of Hirasawa in conjunction with the disclosed LAN of APA for the purpose of providing a method by which multiple computers may efficiently intercommunicate. Taken in combination, with APA, such allows the individual computers of APA Figure 1 to intercommunicate and to further utilize a shared bus/LAN so as to distribute the aforementioned “plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data, said plurality of voice information and said plurality of upstream communications” to the respective upstream/downstream components.

Claims 2, 16, 27, and 41 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a control computer” [36] that is “configured to perform content management and resource allocation” (APA: Page 5, Lines 7-10).

Claims 3, 17, 28, and 42 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a service computer” [20] that is “configured to manager conditional access” (APA: Page 3, Line 3 – Page 4, Line 2).

Claims 4, 18, 29, and 43 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a video server” [38] that is “configured to provide local storage for digital video” (APA: Page 5, Lines 9-10).

Claims 5, 19, 30, and 44 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart interface module is operatively coupled to an Internet computer” [22] that is “configured to communicate Internet data” (APA: Page 4, Lines 2-5).

Claims 6-8 and 31-33 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is operatively coupled to a telephony computer . . . configured to communicate

telephony data” wherein the “telephony computer comprises a switched telephony system . . . configured to communicate telephony data” or the “telephony computer comprises a Voice over IP system . . . configured to communicate telephony data” (APA: Page 5, Lines 16-21).

Claims 9, 20, 34, and 45 are rejected wherein the “at least one smart network interface module is configured to optimize the transfer of a plurality of bits associated with said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data, said plurality of voice information and said plurality of upstream communications across said shared bus” in accordance with the teachings of Hirasawa. The claims do not set forth what is required or condition is being met such that the transfer is considered “optimal”. Accordingly, the limitation is considered met because it is unclear as to why the teachings of Hirasawa would be considered to operate in a non-optimal in light of the reference being an improvement over the prior art.

Claims 10, 21, 35, and 46 are rejected in light of the combined teaching wherein as aforementioned “said at least one smart network interface module is configured to buffer said plurality of digital video, said plurality of digital data said plurality of voice information, and said plurality of upstream communications”.

In consideration of claims 11-14, 22-25, 36-39, and 47-50, the “at least one smart network interface module” are inherently “configured to buffer a plurality of . . . control data” associated with the respective “digital video”, “digital data”, “voice information”, and “upstream communications”. In the downstream direction, APA discloses the particular usage of MPEG-2 transport streams for video data and the Internet Protocol (IP) and the data-over-cable service interface specification (DOCSIS) in connection with the voice and data communications. The usage of these standards disclose and require the usage of

“control information” as necessary to process the incoming/outgoing data. For example, MPEG transport streams require control data (ex. PIDs, timing information, etc. ) in order for the STB to properly decode and reassemble the received transport stream. TCP/IP requires control information as necessary to route messages to the appropriate client/server.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objections made.

- The Adams et al. (US Pat No. 6,124,878) reference discloses a full-service network which employs data buffering.
- The Craven et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0014757 A1) discloses a multi-dwelling unit “digital headend” which utilizes a common shared bus or back plane to interconnect video, voice, and data modules. This reference, does not currently qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102.
- The Byers et al. (US Pat No. 5,781,320) illustrates a network hub which utilizes a common bus and a plurality of video, voice, and data.
- The Wallach et al. (US Pat No. 5,889,965) reference discloses the usage of a modular server architecture which allows for hot swapping of components.
- The Horlin (US Pub No. 2001/0026551) reference discloses a system and method for facilitating a QoS switching arrangement for different traffic types.



Art Unit: 2614

- The Fluss (US Pat No. 6,304,578) reference discloses a system and method for packet routing and queuing at the headend of a shared data communication channel.
- The Chimento et al. (US Pat No. 5,434,848) reference discloses a method for managing traffic in a packet communication network.
- The Hugenberg et al. (US Pub No. 2003/0140353) reference discloses a digital headend and full service network for distributing a variety of services.
- The Lopez (US Pat No. 6,650,096) reference discloses a means for advantageously housing multiple servers within a single housing.
- The Wachel (US Pat No. 6,675,254) reference discloses a system and method for utilizing mid-plane interconnects in conjunction with a rack mount system for a telephony service provider.
- The NetFRAME articles disclose the existence of a cluster server which utilize an internal or shared bus so as to facilitate the distribution of information between functional/logical servers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2614

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SEB  
September 21, 2005

Scott Beliveau  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2614